

REMARKS

Claims 1-17 and 19-41 were presented for examination and were rejected. In the present amendment, claims 1-41 have been amended and new claims 42-62 added. No new matter has been introduced. Upon entry of the present amendment, claims 42-62 will be currently pending in this application, of which claims 42 and 52 are independent. Applicants submit that claims 42-62 are in condition for allowance.

The following comments address all stated grounds of rejection. Applicants traverse all rejections to the extent they are maintained over the new claims and urge the Examiner to pass the claims to allowance in view of the remarks set forth below.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

I. Claims 1-17 and 19-41 Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-17 and 19-41 were presented for examination. The Examiner rejected claims 1-17 and 19-41 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,772,347 to Xie et al. (“Xie”) in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2005/0086262 to Balasubramanian (“Balasubramanian”) and further in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0250124 to Chesla (“Chesla”). Applicants hereby cancel claims 1-17 and 19-41, mooted the rejections with respect to these claims.

PATENTABILITY OF NEW CLAIMS

II. New Claims 42-62 Patentable over Xie, Balasubramanian and Chesla

New claims 42 and 52 are independent claims. Claims 43-51 depend on and incorporate all the patentable subject matter of independent claim 42. Claims 53-62 depend on and

incorporate all the patentable subject matter of independent claim 52. Claim 42 and 52 recites receiving, a first message having a first URL component comprising a plurality of hierarchically related URL components. The plurality of hierarchically related URL components comprises a first URL component and a second URL component. The second URL component is a descendant of the first URL component. The first message is rejected based on a rejection rule that rejects messages having the first URL component. The intermediary device maintains a first number of occurrences of the first URL component in messages received by the intermediary device. The intermediary device further maintains a second number of occurrences of the second URL component in messages received by the intermediary device. The intermediary device determines that a function of the first number of occurrences and the second number of occurrences exceeds a threshold. Responsive to the determination, the intermediary device generates an exception rule to the rejection rule. The exception rule allows messages having the first URL component to pass. The intermediary device receives a second message having the first URL component. The intermediary device identifies that the second message having the first URL component is rejected by the rejection rule. The intermediary device determines that the rejection rule has an exception rule that may allow a message that has been rejected by the rejection rule to pass. The intermediary device allows the second message to pass between the client and the server based on the exception rule that allows messages having the first URL component to pass. Applicants submit that Xie, Balasubramanian and Chesla, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every element of the claimed invention.

In particular, the combination of Xie, Balasubramanian and Chesla fails to teach or suggest maintaining a first number of occurrences of the first URL component in messages received, maintaining a second number of occurrences of the descendant of the first URL

component in messages received, and generating an exception rule to the rejection rule responsive to determining that a function of the first number of occurrences and the second number of occurrences exceeds a threshold. In the Office Action, the Examiner admits that Xie does not specify filtering based on URL components and their descendants, and cites Balasubramanian for a URL prefix/domain feature. However, Balasubramanian fails to contemplate maintaining a first number of occurrences of a first URL component in conjunction with a second number of occurrences of a descendent of the first URL component. Consequently, Balasubramanian also fails to teach or suggest determining that a function of the first number of occurrences and the second number of occurrences exceeds a threshold. Chesla is cited merely for a frequency feature (see Office Action, page 4, lines 18-20) and does not teach or suggest the URL component and descendant features that are lacking in both Xie and Balasubramanian. Accordingly, neither Xie, Balasubramanian or Chesla, alone or in combination, teach or suggest each and every feature of the present claims.

For at least the reasons discussed above, Applicants submit that new claims 42-62 are patentable and in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

In light of the aforementioned amendments and arguments, Applicants contend that each of the Examiner's rejections has been adequately addressed and all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration, withdrawal of all grounds of rejection, and allowance of all of the pending claims.

Should the Examiner feel that a telephone conference with Applicants' attorney would expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the Applicants' attorney at the telephone number identified below.

Respectfully submitted,

CHOATE, HALL & STEWART, LLP

Dated: September 8, 2009

/Christopher J. McKenna/

Christopher J. McKenna

Registration No. 53,302

Attorney for Applicants

Choate, Hall & Stewart, LLP

Two International Place

Boston, MA 02110

(617) 248-5000